

## REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 2, 8-10, 12, 15, 18-20, 22, 25, 28-30, and 33-36 have been previously presented, Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 21, 23-24, 26-27, and 31 have been amended, Claims 37-44 are new, and Claim 32 has been canceled. Claims 1-31 and 33-44 are pending.

### The 101 Rejections

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

#### Claim 1

The Office mentions that “[t]he result of claim 1 is an analysis, and until that analysis is user [sic] and made available it merely comprises a process within a processor without a tangible result.” *Office Action*, p. 2. Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 obviates the grounds for the rejection of Claim 1 and that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

#### Claims 2-4, 6-9

Claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend from Claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

#### Claims 5 and 10

In addition to depending from allowable base Claim 1, Claims 5 and 10 are further allowable because they provide a tangible result. A claimed invention that produces a “useful, concrete, and tangible result” is patentable subject matter. *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.*, 149 F.3d 1368, 1373 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Claim 5 recites “displaying each other component of the at least a subset that comprise at least a subset of similar potential security threat categories as the particular component.” Displaying a component is a tangible result. Consequently, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 5 is directed to patentable subject matter for this reason in addition to depending from base Claim 1 which is also directed to patentable subject matter.

Claim 10 recites “presenting information associated with a particular technology with which to mitigate.” Presenting information is a tangible result. Consequently, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claim 10 is directed to patentable subject matter for this reason in addition to depending from base Claim 1 which is also directed to patentable subject matter.

### **The 102(a) Rejections**

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by “Security Analysis & Design” by Uttara Nerurkar (“Nerurkar”). Applicant respectfully submits that amendments to Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 obviate the grounds for the rejection of Claims 1-36 and that Claims 1-36 are in condition for allowance.

### Conclusion

All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned agent to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 7 July 2006

By: Paul S Holdaway  
Paul S Holdaway  
Reg. No. 56376  
(509) 324-9256 x228